

315/340
6/29/2000

REMARKS

Claims 5-8 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1-4 have been canceled. Claims 5-7 have been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed.

DRAWINGS

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because Applicant fails to show the details of the receiver controller output as described in the specification. The receiver controller 30 illustrated in Figure 3 is the same receiver controller 30 illustrated in Figure 1. That is why both receiver controllers are identified by the reference numeral 30. Applicants have amended Figure 3 to add an arrow illustrating the packet signal after decoding similar to the arrow illustrated in Figure 1. In addition, the specification has been amended by inserting the following sentence on page 8: "The details of the receiver controller 30 are illustrated in Figure 1." Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claim 7 is objected to because of informalities. The listing of the claims in this amendment is believed to overcome any clarity issues. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by IEEE Std 802.11a-1999. Claims 1-4 have been canceled.

Regarding Claim 8, Claim 8 was indicated as allowable on page 5 of the Office Action with a paragraph stating the reasons for indication of allowable subject matter. This fact in conjunction with the fact that Claim 8 was not discussed in the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 leads the Applicants to believe that Claim 8 is allowable.

Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 5-7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 5 and 6 depended from Claim 4. Both Claims 5 and 6 have been amended to independent form to include the limitations of Claim 4 and are thus believed to be allowable. Claim 7 depends from Claim 6.

Claim 8 was indicated as being allowed,

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt

and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 1, 2004

By: 

Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg